Op-Ed Page Editor
The New York Times
229 W. 43 St.,
New York, N.Y. 10036

7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Md. 21702
12/23/91

Nry 2/5, 2/3 Rescripts
6/17 + Nry 6/27/91 arts.

Dear Editor,

Oliver Stone, like the hero of his crass and obvious commercialization and exploitation of the JFK assassination, has great difficulty telling the truth even by accident.

He asks in his December 20 op-ed page article, "Who Is Rewriting History?" with unparalleled arrogance and contempt for truth because he knows that in his movie as well as in this article he rewrote the history of the JFK assassination and his own history in making the movie and because in his article he rewrites the history of criticism of his movie, in fact, what it is all about.

"History may be too importabt to leave to newsmen," he says. The record is clear: it cannot be left to the Oliver Stones who exploit and commercialze great tragedies and present themselves as serving the people and democratic society in their greed and dishonesty.

Because I am the one who caused the exposure of the ffaud and travesty of Stone's movie I not only know why I did it - I wrote and warned/told Stone <u>before he started shooting</u>, on February 8, 1990.

He prefers fighting the battles of Viet Nam all over again in his article but I made no mention of it.

I enclose copies of my letters to him and you can see for yourself that this was not only not what I wrote him about, it was not even in my mind.

When some time passed and Stone did not respond and I was given a copy of his script and was shocked at its crude and political rewriting of the fact of the crime and of Garrison's incredible irresponsibility I decided, not the CIA, as Stone has said over and over again, that what he was up to required exposure.

It is obvious, my first letter preceeding his first shooting by several months, that if Stone were an honest man determined to make an honest movie he had ample time to junk the script based an his embellishment of what he knew was a deliberetely dishonest book and begin fresh.

I have known George Lardner for 25 years. While there is much on which we do not agree I know him to be a conscientious and accurate reporter. I gave him the script and those records he wanted of my own work in New Orleans relating to Garrison. His article was completely accurate. Stone's response was, to say the least, not accurate.

My interest in New Orleans and most of my work there had to do with Oswald's career there. It turned into damage control before the Shaw trial. In my first letter to Stone I told him how when Garrison's staff was unable to talk him out of his outrageous plan for commemorating the fifth anniversary of the JFK assassination and asked me to try I did it.

among other things he was actually going to charge Robert Perrin, his former husband

of a Warren Commission witness, who to Garrison's knowledge had killed himself in New Orleans in 1962, with being a Grassy knoll assassin in Dallas in 1963!

Like Stone, Garrison just made "history" up as he went. I offered Stone all the documentation and information he might want about this and all else. I did not go into much of what I could have because what I had written was already too long and because I wanted to know that he was interested before revealing all the absolute insanity of Garrison's that alas to late I was able to prevent.

I did not, for example, send him my copy of the report on Perrin's suicide that Garrison himself underscored.

I have enough of my report on my investigation of this monstrous adventure in my files and Lardner had all of that before he wrote his greatly understated and completely accurate article. I have copies of a number of relevant Garrison staff memos and of some of the work his investigators did for me to save him and the nation from what he was about to do.

You can make your own evaluation of Stone and what he intended if you read my letter to which he did not respond. You can evaluate his proceedings with what he knew was dishonest after getting this letter.

The false accusations Stone hurls at those who reported honestly what he does not like he cannot address to me. In fact, he never mentions my name except once to the Washington Post. I wrote the first book on the Warren Commission and five more on it and the other official investigations. I filed a series of difficult, costly and time-consuming FOIA lawuits through which I obtained about a quarter of a million pages of those very records that Stone, knowing this, uses your column to demand be released!

Everybody working in the field knows that I give unsupervised access to all who write on the subject. Stone knew it and his so-called "research coordinator" knew it. Neither had any interest at all. The one response I got for, not from Stone, also enclosed, is a thinly-disguised offer of a bribe.

Stone began promoting his movie and himself by telling the world that he would be recording their history for the people and in it would tell them who killed their President, why and how. He knew he could not and would not and would instead give his rewriting of it based on the mendacity of the Garrison vehicle, his book, "On the Trail of the Assassins." That is the one trail Garrison never took.

Unlike the authors of other assassination books that get attention, I am not a conspiracy theorist. My books are factual and they amount to a rather large study of the working of the basic institutions of our society in that time of great stress and since. They brought to light most of what is factual and has been published about this crime. When it is possible I expose the contrived theories as invalid or worse. But I am, in fact, the most severe critic of the Commission and the executive agencies.

My earlier experience is that of a reporter, an investigative reporter, a Senate

investigator and editor, and ~~as~~ of a World War II intelligence analyst (OSS). I came to this work with a different background, with prior professional experience in related fields.

What I have that is factual is more than enough to make a book on this hoax but I am not up to that now. By coincidence, before the mail brought me a copy of Stone's indecent diatribe that he ~~made~~ knew very well would promote his movie, having heard that he had written this article, I began the draft of a lead and summary for a proposed Sunday Magazine article. ~~Whos~~ These sanctmonious monsters who toy with our history and our tragedies for their personal benefit cry out for exposure. I am not sure that I am up to it and I know that anything I now write will require editing. I explain.

I am now almost 79. I have survived a number of surgeries two of which I was not expected to survive. As a result of them and what caused some of them I am weak and severely limited in what I can do and am medically-permitted to do. I cannot stand still other than momentarily, am limited in the use of stairs when most of these records are in our basement, and thus I have only limited access to my own files. I have violated medical instructions in not getting up and walking around the house while whiting this. When I forget as I did the blood does not return as it should from my lower extremities and that tires me more. I must sit with my legs elevated, which means with the typewriter to one side.

But my work is accurate. For all the effort by a number of agencies and those who do not like my work, no serious error has been complained of and there are almost no minor errors.

Those at the Times who ~~have of~~ knew my work, like Peter Kihss and Martin Waldrom (Mo became a dear friend and visited us when he could) are dead or, like Wednell Rawls and John Crewdson and perhaps others I do not remember, seem no longer to be with the Times.

David Wrone, professor of history at the University of Wisconsin at Stevens Point and Gerald McKnight, professor of history at local Hood College, are among those who can give you credentials as evaluated by professionals who are also subject experts.

All I have, which includes about 60 files cabinets of the records Stone has long complained are suppressed, will be a permanent, free public archive at Hood, with no quid pro quo. Thus as they are now, they will always be available, including to the Times.

I add that when Stone talks about "research" and "information" he is talking about theories and not fact. He had mostly conspiracy nuts as his consultants, plus a few on whose names he could trade. I will not see the movie, I have read only an early script, but I am well familiar with Garrison's rewriting of his own history and that compendium of all the nutty theories by Jim Marrs, "Crossfire," the basis of Stone's movie. There is no fact in the movie other than that the President was assassinated and that Jack Ruby killed Oswald. This tells the people only what they knew. The rest mislead, deceives and confuses them and in this is still another of the many works that amount to and are used as self-justification by those agencies that failed to meet their responsibilities. ~~Plesa~~ Please exxuse my typing and my haste. Sincerely, Harold Weisberg

Harold Weisberg